

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are presently pending. Claims 1, 7, 9, 11, 14, 21, 22, and 24 are amended. Claims 1 and 14 are amended to recite “analyzing time and date stamp of a record in the source database to determine if the record has been changed as a result of a change of position of a lot from a first equipment to a second equipment” and “in response to a determination that the record has been changed, locating the record in a target table of the first equipment in the target database based on an identifier of the lot in the record.” These features are supported at least in Fig. 2 of the current specification.

Claims 9 and 22 are amended to recite “determining if a record in the source database has been changed as a result of a change of position of a lot from a first equipment to a second equipment” and “in response to a determination that the record in the source database has been changed, locating a record in a target table of the first equipment in the target database based on an identifier of the lot in the record.” These features are supported at least in Fig. 2 of the current specification.

Claims 11 and 24 are amended to recite “wherein the determining step comprises analyzing time and date stamp of the record in said source database.” These features are supported at least in paragraph 17 of the current specification. No new matter is added as a result of the above amendments. Reconsideration of claims 1-26 is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Advisory Action dated November 21, 2006, the rejections to claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. §101 and §112 have been withdrawn based on the above amendments.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), Claims 1-26

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by newly cited reference to Burney (US Patent No. 4,829,445). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner alleges in the Advisory Action that Burney's List Manager is a database and that Burney's "lists" and "items" are records and tables. Thus, the Examiner alleges that Burney discloses the features as recited in claims 1, 9, 14, and 22. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Burney does not disclose "in response to a determination that the record has been changed, locating the record in a target table of the first equipment in the target database based on an identifier of the lot in the record, and deleting the record from the target table of the first equipment in the target database" The Examiner alleges that Burney discloses such features at steps 10 and 11 of column 16, which states:

10. The DRU 16 informs the host 10 that its task has been completed by sending the host 10 the DRU's History List.
11. The host 10 acknowledges the completion of the task and deletes the entry from the DRU's History List.

Burney merely discloses that the host deletes a task from the DRU's history list once the task has been completed. However, the history list of the DRU's is not a target table of the first equipment as recited in claims 1, 9, 14, and 22. To the contrary, the history list is a source table of the DRU. At column 20, lines 50-53, Burney discloses that the history list is generated by the DRU only after a task is completed. Burney also discloses that "all material carriers that enter a DRU 16 should have an entry on the DRU's Destiny List that tells the DRU what to do with that carrier." (Column 19, lines 23-25) Thus, the history list is merely a source table of DRU and entries are deleted from the history list once a task is completed. This is different from the claimed features of claims 1, 8, 14, and 22, in which the record is located in the target table of the first equipment and deleted from the target table in the target database in response to a determination that the record has been changed. To the contrary, no entry is deleted from the target table, or the Destiny List, in Burney. Therefore, Burney does not disclose "in response to a determination that the record has been changed, locating the record in a target table of the first

equipment in the target database based on an identifier of the lot in the record, and deleting the record from the target table of the first equipment in the target database” as recited in claims 1, 9, 14, and 22.

In addition, Burney does not disclose “inserting the record into a target table of the second equipment in the target database.” The Examiner alleges that Burney discloses these features at column 16, step 3, which states:

3. The host gives each DRU 16 along the carrier path (Routing DRUs) tasks, using SECS stream 127 list modifications, to “hand off” the material carrier 56 from Routing DRU to Routing DRU until the material carrier 56 arrives at the Destination DRU.

In this step, Burney discloses that the host assigns each DRU tasks for handing off the material carrier from one DRU to another until the carrier arrives at the Destination DRU. However, the tasks assigned by the host are not records that are inserted into a target table of the second equipment. At column 17, lines 28-30, Burney discloses that “the host computer network only places tasks on a DRU’s Destiny List that are expected not to fail.” Thus, the tasks are placed in a target table of the first equipment (the Routing DRU from which the material carrier is routed), such that the DRU is told what to do with the material carrier when it is received (column 19, lines 22-25). The tasks are not placed by the host computer in a target table of the second equipment, such as the Destiny List of a Destination DRU. Therefore, Burney also does not disclose “inserting the record into a target table of the second equipment in the target database,” as recited in claims 1, 9, 14, and 22. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of rejection to claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Conclusion

It is clear from all of the foregoing that independent claims 1, 9, 14, and 22 are in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 2-8, 10-13, 15-21, and 23-26 depend from and further limit independent claims 1, 9, 14, and 22 and therefore are allowable as well.

An early formal notice of allowance of claims 1-26 is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Wing Y Mok
Registration No. 56,237

Dated: December 11, 2006

HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
901 Main Street, Suite 3100
Dallas, Texas 75202-3789
Telephone: 972/739-8626
Facsimile: 214/200-0853
Docket No.:
2001-1542 / 24061.440
R-152627

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via EFS-Web on December 11, 2006.


Linda Ingram

Linda Ingram

